

I. Response to Rejections under 35 USC Section 103(a):

At page 5, item 7 of the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as been unpatentable over "Braun" (United States patent No. 4,621,319) in view of "Cai" (United States patents No. 6,631,474) and further in view of "Sellers" (published patent application number 2001/0019369). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Sellers teaches away from the combination of Braun and Cai. The Applicants have amended the independent claims to include the limitations of claim 2 in claims 1, 7, 13, and 18. Claims 2, 8, 14, and 19 are now canceled.

In Cai, a system to coordinate switching between first and second processors and to coordinate cache coherency between first and second processors during switching is disclosed. In Cai a first processor operates at a higher frequency, and consumes more power than a second processor. As noted by the Examiner at page 4, lines 1-4 of the Office Action, the motivation to combine Braun with Cai is to "recognize the benefits of more efficient power conservation by controlling the battery module when the system is under the low-power mode". From a careful reading of Cai, it seems as though the object of Cai is to provide an architecture in which low-power and high-power consumption modes may be selected by the user.

In Sellers, a portable computer system incorporating a rear projection display is disclosed. However, from a careful reading of Sellers, *there does not appear to be any suggestion or mention of any consideration regarding a need to reduce power consumption. Further, as noted in the final sentence of paragraph 31, a "brighter image generator 68" may be needed.* Thus, as Sellers admits that a "brighter" (and more power-consuming) image generator may be needed, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rear projection display system of Sellers is quite likely to consume more electrical power than a traditional, non-rear-projection type display. Therefore, the Applicants assert that the use of an architecture such as that described by Sellers would be incompatible with the design goals set forth by Cai. This is to say that the rear projection display scheme of Sellers would likely preclude the use of the low-power mode of operation of the computer of Cai. For this reason, the Applicants contend that the disclosure of Sellers, in which an increased power


consuming rear-projection display is used, could be nonfunctional in the low-power mode proposed by Cai.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the combination of Braun, Cai, and Sellers is improper since the increased power consuming nature of the rear-projection device of Sellers is incompatible with the low-power consuming aspects of Cai. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to the amended claims and pass the application onto allowance.

II. Additional Fees:

It is not believed that additional fees are due at this time; however, if any additional fee is required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully Submitted,
Weng Wah Loh et al.

By: 
Jeff D. Limon
Agent for the Applicants
Registration Number 45,418

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541) 715-5979
Fax: (541) 715-8581